

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 612

EA 030 957

AUTHOR Pae, Holly
TITLE School Reform: Effects of Site-Based Management Reform Practices on Restructuring Schools To Facilitate Inclusion.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; *Decision Making; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Participative Decision Making; *Professional Autonomy; School District Autonomy; *School Restructuring; Teacher Influence
IDENTIFIERS *West Virginia

ABSTRACT

This report examines West Virginia's education-reform efforts. It focuses on the relationship between a school's level of inclusion and the participatory characteristics of the faculty senate's site-based management. Based on four case studies, the report asks whether the fundamental principles implied by West Virginia's effort to shift to site-based management and the charging of faculty senates to develop school models to support inclusive schools presented a real catalyst for changing educational practices. Specifically, the study asked whether schools with a higher perceived participatory role in decision-making achieved a different level of inclusion than schools with a lower perceived participatory role in decision-making. Findings show that each case study revealed similar results. The impetus for change was largely attributed to how the larger system initially redefined the teachers' positions within the organization. Overall, the degree to which faculty-senate members engaged in developing strategic integration plans did not correlate with the extent of change to their structural model of schooling. Rather, the primary impetus for change was mostly attributed to how the larger system initially redefined the teachers' positions within the organization. The faculty senate served more as an internal force that pushed up on the changes that external forces sent down. (Contains 42 references.) (RJM)

**School Reform: Effects of Site-Based Management Reform Practices
on Restructuring Schools to Facilitate Inclusion**

A Paper presented for Division H: School Evaluation and Program Development
Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, Louisiana
April, 2000

Holly Pae
West Virginia University
P.O. Box 6122
Morgantown, WV 26505
293-3450
hpae@wvu.edu

ED 451 612

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFORM
AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC
COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Pae

2A TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA C30957

This study examined West Virginia's reform efforts to understand how faculty senate's site based management practices effect school restructuring to facilitate inclusion. Several interests prompted this topic's selection. First, this is the first time that a reform, at the national level, emphasizes a goal that gives recognition to individuals with disabilities. Of consequence, we know little about how the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and effort to support inclusive schooling impact education when presented within this context. Second, the goal is to build a restructured, interfaced coordinated service delivery system that deals more effectively with student diversity. In West Virginia each school responded by developing and implementing a Strategic Integration Plan that essentially details how each school adopts the principles of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act on a systemic level. This process provides insight into the levels by which special and regular educators confront their differences and rethink conventional methods of practice. Finally, today's reform strategy seeks change by combining a top down and bottom up approach. West Virginia's efforts provide an opportunity to examine this undertaking and to determine the extent to which this strategy provides schools with a method to envision and practice the spirit of the reform.

A theoretical framework was established to guide the purpose of this study. From a literature review this study identified several theoretical propositions to highlight how current reform's combined components champion a significance. These key components in turn served as the underpinning that informed the study's focus, method of investigation, and process of data examination. The statements below summarize these factors and propositions contained therein:

Reform Strategy Factors:

- A top down change strategy provides an effective method for disseminating reform mandates (Goertz, 1986, 1988; Grossman, Kirst, Negash, & Schmidt-Posner, 1985; Kaye, 1985).
- A top down change strategy alone can not assure that schools carry out such changes in the classroom (Firestone, 1990; Fullan, 1994; Goodlad, 1992; Policy Analysis for California Education, 1986).

- A bottom up change strategy provides an effective method for increasing teacher participation (Taylor & Bogotch, 1994; Taylor & Teddlie, 1992; Weiss, 1992; Wohlsetter, Smyer & Mohrman, 1994).
- A bottom up change strategy, alone does not lead to changes in classroom practice (Elmore, 1993; Hallinger, Murphy & Hausman, 1991; Taylor & Bogotch, 1994; Taylor and Teddlie, 1992; Wohlsetter, Smyer & Mohrman, 1994).

Special Education as a Change Agent Factors:

- From a philosophical vantage point, IDEA's principles and practice for providing a FAPE in a LRE create a contingency requiring educators to conduct an ethical deliberation of schooling (Kauffman & Hallahan, 1995; Lieberman, 1996; Paul & Ward, 1996; Stainback & Stainback, 1990, 1992).
- From a pragmatic vantage point, IDEA's principles and practice for providing an IEP in a LRE create a contingency requiring educators to redefine the school's model of a professional bureaucracy (Skrtic, 1991a, 1991b, 1995).

Reform Strategy Proposition 1:

- Combined top down, bottom up strategies create a more comprehensive and coherent model for change (Firestone, Fuhrman & Kirst, 1990; Fullan, 1994; Peters & Waterman, 1982).

Rationale

- Mandates from above guide the central direction of change and protect the core value it intends to achieve. Decision-making from below provides flexibility and encourages teacher ownership to facilitate goal implementation (Fullan, 1994; Peters & Waterman, 1982).

Reform Strategy Proposition 2:

- Today's student-centered initiatives coupled with decentralized decision making create a comprehensive, multifaceted, systematic change process (Goertz, Floden and O'Day, 1996; Lavelly & McCarthy, 1995; Schrag, 1993).
- By adopting school wide student centered practices, teachers break their relative autonomy and make necessary for the coordination of teams and individuals to support each other

(Duchnowski, Townsend, Hocutt, & McKinney, 1995; Stainback & Stainback, 1990a, 1990b, 1990c, 1996; Villa & Thousand, 1990).

- Student centeredness challenges teachers to question their standardization of practice and to seek new instructional approaches that create a classroom learning atmosphere in which students of varying abilities and interests can achieve their potential (Stainback & Stainback, 1996).

From these patterns of ideas from above, the study postulated that the degree to which faculty senate members engage in developing strategic plans for inclusion correlates with the extent to which their practices reflect a change. Stated differently, this study sought to examine whether schools with a higher perceived participatory role in decision making achieve a different level of inclusion than that of schools with a lower perceived participatory role in decision making. Ultimately, the study's purpose was to examine the degree to which a top down, bottom change strategy combined with a child centered inclusive change goal served as a catalyst of reform.

Methods

The purpose of this research was to conduct four case studies to understand the relationship between the school's level of inclusion and the participatory characteristics of the school faculty senate's site based management. The question was whether the fundamental principles implied by West Virginia's effort to shift to site based management and charging of faculty senates to develop school models to support inclusive schools presented a real catalyst for changing educational practice. The following questions guided this study:

- I. What systemic changes did school's faculty senates make in their restructuring efforts to foster practices for inclusion?
- II. To what extent did these changes result in increased decision-making for teachers regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities?
- III. What was the relationship between schools' inclusion ratios and faculty's perceived role of participatory decision making involvement?

IV. To what extent did the general and special education teacher's perceptions agree regarding their involvement in the special education delivery decision making process?

This study used quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. It organized these features by using a multiple case study strategy. Each school was a subject of an individual case and each case served a specific purpose within the overall scope of inquiry. The rationale underlying this process, therefore, followed a cross-experiment rather than a within-experiment logic of design. Each case served as a unit to predict similar results (a literal replication) or to produce contrary results but for predictable reasons (a theoretical replication, Yin, 1984).

Subjects

Through a census selection process, the study selected four case studies that differed and compared by rank order percentage of students receiving special education. Two counties with high (22.17%, 20.20%) and low percentages (15.97% and 14.26%) were selected (West Virginia Department of Education, 1997). From this pool four schools containing grades' six, seven, and eight were identified. This selection criterion was used because it included schools that have already identified the majority of students eligible for special education services, given a majority of students served in special education are identified by this time in their school career (U.S. Department of Education, 1995) and excluded high schools where drop out and vocational programs decrease the number of students who actually receive special education services. Because the initial sample included all middle schools in the state of West Virginia, it included the distribution of the state's geographic and demographic diversity (large and small, urban and rural).

Instrumentation and Procedure

This study employed four data collection strategies: artifact examination; observation; teacher survey; and teacher interview. Each strategy was conducted over a sixteen week period between the months of August and December 1999.

Artifact Examination. The artifact examination involved an analysis of each case study's Strategic Plan for Managing the Inclusion of Students with Special Needs into the General Classroom. The purpose was to gain insight into the school's belief structure and behaviors by

conducting an unobtrusive examination of the information that they generated for their own purposes. To guide this process, a content analysis protocol was developed to examine each of the plan's six components in relation to the requirements and suggestions described in the A Strategic Planning Guide for West Virginia Faculty Senates (1994).

Survey. The purpose of the survey was to determine the relationship between how the participants perceived their role as a faculty senate member and the degree to which their school integrated students with disabilities in the regular classroom. Questions from the Effective Practice Checklist: Building Level provided in A Strategic Planning Guide for West Virginia Faculty Senates (West Virginia Department of Education, 1994) was used to develop fifty question statements. Using a Likert scale the participants responded by selecting a score that best reflects their beliefs and opinions about the statement. The response scale was as follows: one (never), two (rarely), three (sometimes), four (usually), and five (always). The survey also provided five additional questions that briefly asked for information about their educational background and teaching responsibilities.

The survey was piloted at two middle schools with sixty-eight teachers. These pilot survey responses were factor analyzed to reduce the data. The analysis also examined each item individually and in relation to the entire survey to establish reliability, validity, and to shorten as necessary. The factor analysis and reliability procedures eliminated twenty-five questions. A component factor analysis of the remaining thirty questions created four scales: Professional Practice, (reliability alpha of .8514); School Site Based Management Climate, (reliability alpha of .9155); Collaborative Teaming, (reliability alpha of .9017); and Student Involvement, (reliability alpha .8387). This survey was disseminated at each case study's first faculty Senate Meeting.

Observation. Over a four month period of time, multiple of observations were conducted to enrich the researcher's understanding of the climate and context of the setting being studied. Field notes were used to record observations at a minimum of two faculty senate meetings and thirteen all day visitations at each site. These field notes: characterized the substance and nature of the interaction that occurred at the faculty senate meetings; described events that occurred periodically

throughout the school day; detailed classroom instructional activities; and recorded conversations and informal discussions between teachers and researcher.

Interviews. A loosely constructed interview protocol was used to conduct interviews. The protocol contained questions related to three areas of interest: teacher involvement with inclusion strategic plan process; opinion and knowledge about strategic plan's components; and evaluation of the plan's impact upon practice. During the interview, responses were audio taped and recorded using the note taking procedures described by Dillman (1978) and Spradley (1979).

Data Analysis and Presentation

Using a cross-experiment design, the data analysis procedures involved organizing the collected data into four case study site profiles. Each individual case thereby consisted of a "whole" study. To create the individual case study profiles, an appropriate analysis of the embedded units (four data collection strategies) was first used within in each case. For example, a Content Analysis protocol as described by Putt and Springer (1989) guided the strategic inclusion plan content data analysis. Observation field notes collected during on-site visits were analyzed in accordance with established principles of qualitative research analysis (McMillan & Schumacher, 1993; Spradley, 1979) and reduced by sorting each data source into categories (Glasser & Strauss, 1967). The teacher survey composite scores were calculated after principle component analysis of the survey was conducted. Finally, by using a pattern matching process, the theoretical proposition was used to seek convergent evidence regarding the facts and conclusions for the case. Each case's conclusions were then examined in relation to the other individual cases (Campbell, 1969; Yin, 1984). Ultimately, the case study comparison determined whether their outcome patterns coincided or contradicted with emerging theoretical predictions.

Results

The results below only contain the major findings identified in the cross case analysis. (The results for each case study's profile are thereby omitted due to the time constraints of this presentation.) A summary of these findings is listed below.

1. The degree to which faculty senate members engaged in developing strategic integration plans did not correlate with the extent to how their structural model of schooling ultimately changed. The primary impetus for change instead was largely attributed to how the larger system initially redefined the teachers' positions within the organization.
2. Three of the case studies restructured their service delivery model by redefining the special educator's role. The system restructured the staff patterns by merging existing programs. By interfacing teacher responsibilities, the outcomes consequently advanced the system to some degree to become a more cohesive, coordinated model.
3. Schools have unique set of characteristics that effect how change is internalized. In each case the faculty senates' integration plans supported yet tailored how change was implemented. The faculty senate thereby served as an internal force that pushed up on the changes that external forces sent down.
4. The faculty senates' integration plans primarily addressed staffing, planning, and training needs to facilitate an integrative model of schooling and gave limited attention to activities that related to the teacher's classroom practice and student involvement.
5. The case studies' special education enrollment and county percentage of students receiving special education services did not impact the school's level of integration.
6. The school's staffing patterns greatly impact teacher's level of collaboration. The levels of collaboration achieved is relative to the teacher's team affiliation and classroom model assignment.
7. The special educator who collaboratively taught with a regular educator shared a greater level of reciprocity in determining classroom practice than that of the special educators who provided consultative services with the regular educator.
8. More than half of the school's special educators continue to work in separate settings and do not have team membership. Special educators not affiliated with a team had the lowest level of interaction with others even if teachers shared student responsibility.

9. The faculty senates in schools with higher levels of integration made different types of decisions than that of faculty senates in schools with lower levels of integration.
10. Schools where faculty senates engage in decision making regarding school and teacher related concerns had a higher level of integration then that of schools where faculty senates engage in decision making regarding student concerns.

Discussion

In this study a pattern emerged. Each case study profile's revealed similar results (a literal replication) and contrary results for predictable reasons (a theoretical replication, Yin, 1984). From a systemic point of view, the impetus for change in each case was largely attributed to how the larger system initially redefined the teachers' positions within the organization. The study's conclusions therefore did not find that the degree to which faculty senate members engaged in developing strategic integration plans correlated with the extent to how their structural model of schooling ultimately changed. This is not to say that the schools that were studied did not undergo a restructuring process; rather the faculty senate was not responsible for redefining the delivery model of service. The plan's staffing model instead reflected the degree to which the system induced change and not the degree to which the faculty senate engaged in the plan's development.

An understanding of the bureaucratic nature of schooling provides insight to interpreting these findings. It is known that the schools arrange and define a teacher's position within the organization based on expertise. While the teacher's level of acquired training decreases the organization's need to regulate their work it also reinforces the teachers to perceive their role as important and interdependent to the system's operations. The teacher's sense of professionalism consequently diverts their attention from envisioning a model that questions their position's validity. It is therefore predictable that the restructuring of the school's staffing patterns resulted from changes introduced by the greater system and not by the faculty senate's plans.

In each of the case studies, however, the faculty senates served as an internal force that pushed up on the changes that external forces sent down. Their plans supported yet tailored how change was implemented. Because each plan differently defined how teachers were to interact, the

four case studies ultimately revealed that schools have unique set of characteristics that effect how change is internalized. In other words, each school operated under the same guidelines put forth by the Federal, Individual with Disabilities Education Act, and State, Integrative Schools Initiative mandate, yet each sought different practices to achieve the same goal. From a change strategy perspective, this phenomenon illustrates how top down mandates coupled with school based decision making creates a relationship that is complex, nonlinear, and yet complementary. The mandates from above guided the central direction of change and protected the core value it intended to achieve while the decision making from below provided flexibility and encouraged teacher ownership to facilitate goal implementation.

In three of the case studies, the schools restructured their service delivery model by redefining the special educator's role. Several teachers were assigned to a regular education team to provide collaborative support within in the regular education setting. Because the schools did not hire additional teachers to fulfill this role, the schools essentially decreased the number of separate settings by reassigning the students and special educators to integrated classrooms. Opposed to creating add-ons, the schools merged existing programs. Consequently these efforts advanced the system to some degree to become a more cohesive, coordinated model by interfacing teacher responsibilities. It is noteworthy that the case studies' special education enrollment and county percentage of students receiving special education services did not correlate with the level of integration the schools achieved. Two schools that had a similar number of students with IEPs, one school maintained seven separate classroom settings, whereas the other only had two. These findings reveal that goal achievement is not contingent upon factors, such as student enrollment, over which schools have little control. It instead suggests that outcomes relate to how the schools coordinated their service delivery system to become more cohesive model.

The degree to which the schools achieved a comprehensive, multifaceted level of change however is of suspect. Although three schools increased their level of integration by assigning the students to the regular classroom setting and the special educator to their team, more than half of the school's other special educators continue to work in separate settings and do not have team

membership. This is problematic because across the four case studies a pattern emerged whereby the teacher's level of collaboration related to their team affiliation and classroom assignment. The highest level of interaction occurred between staff who worked together in the same classroom. Teachers assigned to the same teams likewise had a high level of interaction. Teachers not assigned to a team however primarily worked alone regardless if they shared student responsibility. These findings clearly demonstrate that the school's staffing patterns greatly impact teacher's level of collaboration. Furthermore, by assigning a special educator to a team the school not only changed that teacher's role and responsibilities but a lesser extent increased the other team member's involvement in determining student placement.

Within the teams a pattern emerged with regard to the types of decisions the teachers made and the degree to which classroom practice changed. In the one school where the special educator collaboratively taught with a regular educator the teacher shared a greater level of reciprocity in determining classroom practice than that in the two schools where the special educator shared consultative services with the regular educator. Across the four case studies however the regular educators reported that their classroom's increase in students with IEPs did not change their practice. The special educators who worked in integrated settings on the other hand reported that their practices changed from determining what to teach to how to support the other's teachings. These findings suggest that the increased level of integration did not result in having an equally compelling impact on whether classroom practice changed.

The reason the data failed to reflect an increased change in classroom practice is difficult to ascertain. The survey data across the four schools reported that teachers perceived to have a higher level of professional practice in comparison to the factors that related to their perceived levels of participation in site base management and collaboration. Perhaps teachers do not perceive the increased level of integration as an impetus that changed the classroom's composition of student need. Although the literature supports that students with IEPs have similar needs to peers who also have difficulty, it nonetheless calls into question how and the degree to which the teacher's notion of a disability imparts the need to change practice. It may be that the teacher's repertoire of practice

accommodates student difference. On the other hand, the degree to which teachers seek change may be limited by a perceived need to maintain a notion of standard. It is of question whether the integrated classrooms meet student need or if their practices warrant change.

The lack of reported change in practice may also relate to how each school's plans commonly noted goals and objectives that related to staffing, planning, and training needs to facilitate an integrative model of schooling. The focus of these items was administrative in nature and primarily dealt with issues that promoted the organizational aspects of change. In contrast the plans gave limited attention to activities that related to how teachers at the classroom level facilitate an inclusive environment. For example, the plans did not detail how teachers adapt, modify, and support instruction to meet individual student need. The strategic plans likewise included minimal concerns that promote student socialization, participation, and extracurricular involvement.

The lack of respect to these items may relate to how the teacher's perceive their role in determining decisions that impact teacher practice. The concerns addressed in the plans are impersonal in the sense that they define teacher opportunity such as the availability of joint planning time. In contrast, items not addressed are personal in that they describe behaviors that teachers must practice. The rationale used to understand why the greater system and not the faculty senate plans created the changes that reorganized the school's staffing pattern may be pertinent. From a change strategy point of view, the bureaucratic structure of schooling may thwart teacher's ability and propensity to make decisions that systematically define the quality of teacher practice. The bureaucracy arranges and defines the teacher's position within the organization in order to maintain a stable environment. This condition pragmatically impedes the teachers' ability to determine individual's mode of practice, employment, or status. The teacher's level of expertise also loosely couples the teachers within the organization to allow them to work directly with students and less with their peers. As a result, teachers only collectively control their colleagues' practice and lack the standpoint to redefine each other's role within the larger system.

The purpose of this study ultimately sought to examine whether schools with a higher perceived participatory role in decision making achieve a different level of inclusive practices then

that of schools with a lower perceived participatory role in decision making. The conclusions demonstrated that the school's level of inclusion had a relationship with the faculty senate's level of involvement with committee decision making and types of decisions the teachers made. The findings however did not ascertain whether this relationship demonstrated a difference in levels of participation but only that there is a difference in the type of decisions.

The emerged pattern reveals that the two case studies with a greater level of integration had fewer faculty senate committees. Their faculty senates spent more time discussing an agenda presented by administration and less time on teacher driven proposals. The majority of their decisions also dealt with concerns that benefit teachers. The two schools with lower levels of integration on the other hand had a greater number of faculty senate committees. They spent more faculty senate time on discussing teacher driven proposals and the majority of their decisions dealt with concerns that benefit students.

These findings suggest that the school's level of integration influences the dynamics of the school's decision making practices. In each case study the majority of the teachers are assigned to team and each team has the opportunity to meet daily during a common planning period. The data supports that these team's decisions primarily concerned their student and classroom practice. The focus of these decisions therefore was to benefit the student. In schools with higher levels of inclusion, it is reasonable to assume that the student composition within the teams has greater diversity and thereby creates less variability across programs. This diversity in turn creates the need for the teams to engage in decision making to address a variety of different concerns. As a result, the teams may decrease faculty senate's need to engage in these types of decisions. In other words, if the team's decisions bring benefit to students that have a greater diversity of need, the role their faculty senates have less need to engage in student related concerns and can focus more on making decisions that benefit the teachers and school.

In contrast the schools with a lower level of inclusion have greater homogeneity within the classroom and a greater level of student diversity across programs. In teams where there is less student diversity the team's decision making process concerns students with fewer differences. As

each team concerns different student needs, the variance across programs increases. For example, the team of special educators deal with a different set of student concerns in comparison to the team's decisions that do not have students with IEPs. As a result the school decreases the likelihood that the programs share the same mode of operation. These differences in turn may give rise to the need of faculty senates to seek methods that micro-manage practice across programs. In other words, the level of program variability or seclusion fragment the organization's mode of operation into a series of different units and thereby cause the faculty senates to engage in more student related decisions in response to the school's needs to seek cohesion.

Limitations. Although a repeated pattern emerged among the case studies, the validation of the findings warrants a replication of study. The process, however, needs to recognize that the study's primary focus examined West Virginia's reform efforts. As a result this state specific framework questions the degree to which this study may be replicated in other states. Such practice would require a need to revise the instruments' foci in accordance to that particular state's policy mandates. Each case study was a middle school. In this setting, the majority of the staff are members of teams. Each team teaches the same students and shares a planning period to facilitate collaborative relationships. This organizational structuring differs from the elementary and high school settings where teachers are not assigned to teams. The generalization of findings therefore may not replicate in these other settings. Finally, the data regarding each case studies' special education only includes students with IEPs in the areas of learning disabilities, behavior disorders, and mild and moderate mental impairments. The results therefore are limited to the mild and moderate special education population and do not include students in the severe and multiple or gifted education programs.

Implications. Education reform treats the American public school system as an enterprise needing continual reshaping toward the achievement of excellence and equity. These initiative's distinct and compelling efforts consequently provide several insights to our knowledge about change. In this study, their successes and shortcomings demonstrate how education is a complex, multifaceted organization. In order to best understand this phenomenon research practice needs to

continue to develop equally sophisticated methods and instruments that appropriately take into consideration the dynamic nature of schooling. Furthermore, each setting or school has a unique set of characteristics that have an impact on how change is internalized. Our research design must have the capability that provides the level of sensitivity that can appreciate and identify these nuances that make each school unique.

In today's reform, mandates from above send schools guiding principles that favor decentralized practices. In theory, because these efforts combine previous reform's top-down and bottom-up change strategies, they provide a change model that is comprehensive. The findings of this study however suggest that the bureaucratic nature of schooling continues to have an impact on how change translates into practice. To overcome these barriers top down mandates must initially provide the effort to restructure the staffing patterns within the organization if the goal is to change the nature in which teachers interact. Furthermore, it is not enough to examine only practice or policy: the complexity of schooling requires a simultaneous understanding of both. Our methods of study in turn need to inform policy and practice in a manner that is meaningful to each.

Because the emphasis of change focuses on the needs of all students, it is questionable how well our policies and practice incite teachers to consider ideas that challenge their own instructional practice. In this study, the majority of teachers addressed individual student need in the regular classroom setting by adapting and modifying instructional materials and approach. What is lacking in our knowledge is whether best practice needs to rethink the traditional curriculum model. In other words, instead of altering existing practice, it is of question whether we need to ultimately revamp practice and adopt a new instructional approach. Furthermore, this study also suggests that the teachers' area of content specialization influences how they perceive their role in site based management. In the teacher survey and interviews, the comparison of special educators, general educators, and related arts teachers' responses differed. Although such findings warrant further understanding, they also imply the need for future study to consider the teacher's role as an important variable that has an impact on outcomes. Finally, as schools continue to merge programs in effort to build a restructured, interfaced coordinated service delivery system, research must also

continue to identify best practice from a systemic point of view and take into consideration the needs of this model.

The study's outcomes also provide several implications for future teacher education and school administration training programs. In order to adequately prepare educators to effectively engage in site based management decision making, training programs need to develop teacher competency in the area of collaboration and group decision making. Such topics may include, the art of working on committees, effective communication skills, and methods for linking program development to classroom practice. Furthermore, teacher training programs need to support teacher awareness of how site based management advances their ability to shape school practice. By acknowledging and developing their notion of empowerment, teacher training programs may better facilitate teachers to assume a more active role in school base decision making. School administrative training programs in turn need to prepare our future leaders in how to support teachers to engage in site based decision making activities. By using a holistic, school centered perspective administrators can improve their skills in how to promote, facilitate, and effectively achieve purposeful change at the school level through site based management techniques.

In sum, the notion equity and excellence must transcend all aspects of the reform process. First, we need to continue to restructure our schools to promote teachers to share expertise. While site based management theoretically provides each faculty member an equal opportunity to shape and to define best practice, policy must continue to seek new methods to support this goal achievement. Second, in order to assure that all teachers create an atmosphere that strives to achieve equity and excellence for their students, research and policy must continue to identify practices that address the needs of all students. These endeavors make necessary to produce methods that provide on-going, formative evaluation processes that inform both practice and policy. Ultimately, policy and practice need to continue to identify supports that strive for excellence in a manner that gives parity to the concerns of the individual student as well as to the individual teacher. From this parity we need to identify new practices that challenge the traditional

conventions of schooling and provide education with a comprehensive and coherent model for achieving deep structural reform.

Reference

Campbell, D. T. (1969). Reforms as experiments. American Psychologist, 24, 409-429.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Duchnowski, A., Townsend, B., Hocutt, A., & McKinney, J. (1995). Designing studies that are sensitive to the complexity of inclusion: Creating a knowledge base. In J. L. Paul, H. Rosselli & D. Evans (Eds.), Integrating school restructuring and special education reform, (pp. 373-388). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Elmore, R. F. (1993). School decentralization: Who gains? who loses? In J. Hannaway & C. Carnoy (Eds.), Decentralization and school improvement (pp. 33-54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Firestone, W. A. (1990). Continuity and incrementalism after all: State responses to the excellence movement. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases (pp. 143-165). Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Firestone, W., Fuhrman, S., & Kirst, M. (1990). An overview of education reform since 1983. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases, (pp. 349-363). Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Fullan, M. G. (1994). Coordinating top-down and bottom-up strategies for educational reform. In R. J. Anson (Ed.), Systemic reform: Perspectives on personalizing education (pp. 7-24). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Glaser, B. G. V. & Strauss, L. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Goertz, M. E. (1986). State educational standards: A 50 state survey. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Goertz, M. E., Floden, R. E., & O'Day, J. (1996). Studies of educational reform: Systemic reform. (Report No. ORAD 96-132). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 1.302

Goodlad, J. (1992). On taking school reform seriously. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(3), 232-38.

Grossman, P., Kirst, M., Negash, W., & Schmidt-Posner, J. (1985). Curriculum change in California comprehensive high schools: 1982-83 to 1984-85. Berkeley: Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), University of California.

Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., & Hausman, C. (1991). Conceptualizing school restructuring: Principals' and teachers' perceptions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Kauffman, J. M., & Hallahan, D. P. (1995). The illusion of full inclusion. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Kaye, L. (1985). Making the grade? Assessing school districts progress on SB 813. Sacramento: California Tax Foundation.

Lavelly, L., & McCarthy, M. A. (1995). Early intervention in the context of school reform and inclusion. In J. L. Paul, H. Rosselli, & D. Evans (Eds.), Integrating school restructuring and special education reform (pp. 79-104). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Lieberman, M. L. (1996). Preserving Special Education...for those who need it. In W. C. Stainback & S. B. Stainback (Eds.), Controversial issues confronting special education: Divergent perspectives (2nd ed., pp. 16-27). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1993). Research in education: A conceptual introduction. New York, NY: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Paul, P. V., & Ward, M. E. (1996). Inclusion paradigms in conflict. Theory into practice, 35(1), 4-11.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons for America's best-run companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Policy Analysis for California Education. (1986). Conditions of education in California, 1986-87. Berkeley CA.: Author.

Putt, A. D., & Springer, A. F. (1989). Policy research: Concepts, methods, and applications. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Schrag, J. A. (1993). Restructuring schools for better alignment of general and special education. In J. I. Goodlad, & T. C. Lovitt (Eds.), Integrating general and special education (203-228). New York: Macmillan.

Skrtic, T. M. (1991a). The special education paradox: Equity as the way to excellence. Harvard Educational Review, 61(2), 148-206.

Skrtic, T. M. (1991b). Behind special education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization. Denver, CO: Love Publishing.

Skrtic, T. M. (1995). The organizational context of special education and school reform. In E. L. Meyen, & T. M. Skrtic (Eds.), Special education and student disability: An introduction traditional, emerging and alternative perspectives (pp. 729-792). Denver CO: Love Publishing Company.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1990a). Facilitating support networks. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Support networks for inclusive schooling: Independent integrated education (pp. 25-36). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1990b). Inclusive schooling. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Support networks for inclusive schooling: Independent integrated education (pp. 3-23). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Stainback, S. & Stainback, W. (Eds.). (1992). Curriculum considerations in inclusive classrooms: Facilitating learning for all students. Baltimore: Brookes.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1990c). Support facilitators that work. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Support networks for inclusive schooling: Independent integrated education (pp. 37-48). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. (Eds.). (1990). Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education. Baltimore: Brookes.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1996). Rationale for inclusive schooling. In S. Stainback & W. Stainback (Eds.), Inclusion: A guide for educators (pp. 3-15). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Taylor, D. L. & Bogotch, I. E. (1994). School-level effects of teachers' participation in decision making. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16(3) 302-319.

Taylor, D. L. & Teddlie, C. (1992). Restructuring and the classroom: A view from a reform district. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

U.S. Department of Education. (1995). To assure the free appropriate public education of all children with disabilities. Seventeenth Annual Report to the Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Villa, R., & Thousand, J. S. (1990). Administrative supports to promote inclusive schooling. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Support networks for inclusive schooling: Independent integrated education (pp. 151-166). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Weiss, C. (1992). Shared decision making about what? A comparison of schools with and without teacher participation. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association.

West Virginia Department of Education. (1994). A strategic planning guide for West Virginia Faculty Senates. Charleston, WV: Author.

West Virginia Department of Education. (1997). Exceptional students in West Virginia's county school districts: Selected enrollment and financial information. Charleston, WV: Author.

Wohlsetter, P., Smyer, R., & Mohrman, S. A. (1994). New boundaries for school-based management: The high involvement model. Educational Evaluation, 16(3), 268-286.

Yin, R. K. (1984). Case study research: Design and methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.